DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 001 EA 015 158

AUTHOR Goldhammer, Keith
TITLE The Context of Education in the 1980's: The Need for Educational Statesmanship.
PUB DATE 16 Aug 82
NOTE 32p.; Walter J. Cocking Lecture, presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (36th, San Marcos, TX, August 15-20, 1982).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; Administrators; Cultural Context; Democracy; Democratic Values; *Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; *Leadership Training; Politics; Postsecondary Education; *Social Problems; *Social Values; Western Civilization

ABSTRACT

A substantial review of both the goals of Western civilization and the political realities of American democracy serves to establish the context in which the author of this lecture considers the problems facing educational administrators and the institutions that train them. Noting the failure of civilization to assure mankind of its basic needs for health, security, and freedom, and the tendency of our political system to respond to the shifting pressures of mutually opposed special interest groups by resisting change, the author asserts that statesmanship is the quality most needed in today's leaders, and particularly in educational leaders. To encourage the development of leaders who are both knowledgeable and able to apply their knowledge practically, the author proposes a six-element approach. First, programs should be designed on a scientific basis; second, emphasis should be placed on applicative aspects of the scientific knowledge developed; third, clinical experience should be achieved through effective internship programs; fourth, administrators must specialize in teaching and learning rather than management; fifth, society's realities must be stressed in training as well as in practice; and sixth, the ethical principles of administration and the administrator must be dealt with. (Auhtor/PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED223001

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
K. Goldhammer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE CONTEXT OF EDUCATION IN THE 1980's: THE NEED FOR EDUCATIONAL STATESMANSHIP

****

Keith Goldhammer
Professor of Administration and Curriculum
Michigan State University

Walter J. Cocking Lecture

36th National Conference of Professors
of Educational Administration
Southwest Texas State University
San Marcos, Texas
August 16, 1982

CG 015 158

The Context of Education in 1980

Western culture has been characterized by the principle that the essence of human life is its constant search for perfection. Growth, progress, improvement, search, striving, and excellence--these are the hallmarks of the culture into which we were born. It is difficult for us to adjust to any other norms. A period dominated by the need for adjustment, deflation, and recession appears to be the ultimate sign that decadence has set in.

Life has always had its travails, and each generation has felt that it lived in troubled times and longed for the realization of that "peace which surpasseth understanding." But there has been no such peace! The ultimate ideal for which mankind has striven has always been elusive. The vision has been a dream and a spur to action, but whenever we have felt that we were on the verge of grasping it, the vision has moved another step away.

In the darkest days of the Battle for Britain, Churchill and Roosevelt met on the high seas to formulate a statement of what the free world should be like following the hoped for victory. Almost a year before our formal entry into the war, to help save Britain and to motivate Congress into passing his lend-lease program, Roosevelt delivered the Atlantic Charter to Congress, in his famous "Four Freedoms" speech. The date was January 6, 1941. He said:

> "In the future days which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four

essential human freedoms.

The first is freedom of speech and expression -- everywhere in the world.

The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way -- everywhere in the world.

The third is freedom from want -- which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants -- everywhere in the world.

The fourth is freedom from fear, which, translated into world terms, means a world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough manner that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor -- anywhere in the world.

That is no vision for a distant millenium. It is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our own time and generation. That kind of world is the very antithesis of the so-called "new order" of tyranny which dictators seek to create with the crash of a bomb.

To that new order we oppose the greater conception -- the moral order. A good society is able to face schemes of world domination and foreign revolutions alike without fear."

This was the dream! We sacrificed, fought, worked, and prayed that this new proclamation of the essence of human dignity in a free world could be made into a reality. Now, forty years later, we discover that there are more people of the world penalized for speaking freely than who enjoy the right. Limitations on freedom to speak and to write exist over more than 60 percent of the inhabited surface of the globe. The written word is allowed to serve the political ends of those in power, rather than the disinterested search for truth and understanding. In many instances, the meanings of words have been lost and no longer bear their traditional significance.

In this 20th Century there are still vast stretches of earth on which the freedom to believe and to worship or not to worship as one chooses is sadly lacking. The tragic events in Iran show how fragile the concept of freedom to worship is. Not only does an official religion dictate what to believe, but equally how to conduct almost every phase of one's life. People are arrested, tried, and executed in systems of so-called "justice" which are less concerned about human rights and integrity than the witchcraft tribunals of 200 years ago. Even in our own land, there are powerful forces present which would, if they could, dictate to the consciences of the rest of us, capture the media and the public schools, and define a requisite orthodoxy in politics, education, economics, and morality, as well as in religion.

In 1949, President Truman stated that more than half of the peoples of the world were living under conditions "approaching misery". He observed that they had inadequate health care and were living under economic conditions which were primitive and stagnant. Their access to food, clothing, and adequate shelter was so limited that they could readily become pawns for whoever offered them the slightest relief from their sufferings.

Still today, it is estimated that more than one-third of the children of the world live out their childhood and youth on the verge of starvation. There are more human beings without adequate sanitation and medical care than with it. There are more elderly people who, after a life of productive work and struggle to maintain existence, face an impoverished rather than a secure retirement.

In our own country, disparity between wealth and poverty

is almost as great as the extremes throughout the world. We, too, have children who are ill-fed, ill-housed, ill-clothed, and subject to the elements and ravages of disease. We hear that we need greater excellence in education for them, while the current administration seeks to solve their educational problems by the introduction of voucher systems and has even proposed the substitution of catsup for the vegetables in their federally sponsored lunches.

Where is the freedom from fear? The great powers of the earth have more nuclear warheads in their arsenals than are necessary to destroy human civilization, but still they want more. We have forgotten the wisdom of Woodrow Wilson who recognized that the economies of the world could never be directed toward the relief of human misery and want so long as governments overburdened the populace with demands for increasingly larger budgets for armamentation. Even the nations with the highest incidence of poverty felt it necessary to buy and maintain the magnificent, technologically sophisticated implements of destruction, while their masses live in poverty and squalor.

The theoreticians of military science have written of war as an instrument of politics. Wilson strove to establish a League of Nations to outlaw war and to bring an end to the overburdening of populations with armament races. Although he failed, he influenced one of his junior cabinet members, who, when he became the chief executive, was instrumental in establishing the United Nations. But their dreams appear to have been in vain. The United Nations, itself, has become an instrument of international power plays, to such an extent that it not only has failed to settle significant international disputes, but it

can't even take a forthright stand on such as elemental evidences of savagery as the holding of hostages and the use of terror as instruments for international politics. Herodotus, more than 2500 years ago, described the Greek practice of taking hostages as wanton barbarism unworthy of civilized people. Has the world made no progress in all that time in achieving dreams of a world order built upon principles of decency and morality?

There is a banality in the Atlantic Charter. Although dramatically presented, it contains no new ideals. Berkson summarized the essence of the Judeo-Christian ethic as including concern for human freedom, the integrity of the individual, the use of reason to search for truth, the translation of principles of morality into laws binding upon the community, the governance of human relations through principles of justice, the everlasting search of humankind for peace--a surcease of conflict and an opportunity to live out one's life in security without fear.

Are these principles merely the rhetoric of academicians or do they have a substance as rational principles useful in guiding human endeavor? Are they worth living for, striving to achieve and, if need be, dying for? Are these still the ideals of the free world in its struggle in the not-so-cold war against contemporary totalitarianism? Must human beings be lead and dominated by strong leaders who have usurped the instruments of power? Is the dream of twenty centuries of western scholars, philosophers, theologists, and public leaders finally to be laid to rest? Are these the dreams of a generation which had its day and failed? Do the young today need a different set of

of ideals? These were the values of generations of people, beginning with semitic shepherds and Greek philosophers who sought to find the meaning of life. They believed that the protection of the integrity of each person was the proper end of collective action. Is today's youth to be served by an ideal which holds that people don't count as individuals, for it is the collective that matters? I think these are the questions which we in education today must attempt to answer, and we must have more than glib rhetoric to respond to them.

This nation faces some complex political problems. The education of the masses has not been an unmixed blessing. Having helped individuals become adept at using the instrument of politics, educators, themselves, may be the victims of their own success. At one time, administrators had a very limited section of the population with whom to interact. The basic reality of every public official today is that every group in our society has acquired skill in the manipulation of the instruments of governance and seeks to attain its ends with as little compromise as possible. Ours is a politically fragmented society, in which the success of any politician depends upon the extent to which he can give the appearance of delivering advantages to his constituents.

One of the great but rarely read philosophers of the United States, Elijah Jordan, viewed the process of legislation in a democratic society as the search for those basic principles of social governance which bring truth to bear upon the resolution of human problems in accordance with recognized ethical principles. Today, Jordan may be viewed as another idealistic, impractical, academic dreamer. Politicians act on the basis of polls, pressure, and the advice of

political consultants who assess the values of decisions in terms of the differences between the votes they gain and the votes they lose. The exchange value of votes is the issue foremost in the minds of politicians. Even the President of the United States told a press conference that the ethics of politics had to be based on the number of votes an action would secure in the November election.

One of the consequences of our political fractionation is the massive litigiousness which has corroded our legal system. To satisfy disparate constituencies, legislatures have created entitlements to priviledges and regulations which limit the capacity of officials and administrators to exercise discretion on the basis of professional knowledge and fundamental principles. An army of legal experts on entitlements and regulations has been created to take advantage of the popular effort to get as much as possible out of the system. As interpreters of the law, the courts are inundated with frivolous cases which employ a shotgun approach to test the extent to which laws, rules, and regulations can be stretched to meet private ends. In spite of the pressure, the courts have performed a valiant service to the nation in attempting to safeguard human rights and sift the justified claims from the purely self-serving bulk. John Dewey wrote brilliantly of the eclipse of the public interest half a century ago, and he warned that such an eclipse would lead to the making of public decisions to serve personal opportunism rather than the needs of the commonwealth. E. Pendleton Herring, picking up on Dewey's thesis, studied regulatory agencies only to find that they had become captives of the regulated rather than protectors of the public welfare. Is it any wonder that the deregulation of the current administration has not served its intended purpose?

The seemingly most remarkable aspect of our political life today is the fact that it is centered around the goals of segmented groups rather than upon a state, local or national social interest. Charles Wilson contributed that great concept to the national ethos, when he said, "If it is good for General Motors, it is good for the Nation." And each special interest group has now substituted its name for Wilson's pet company and said, along with Walter Lippman, that politics is the art of feathering one's own nest.

The result of our political fragmentation is governmental stalemate. Vast corps of assistants to legislators and officials constantly test the winds and balance the information of political effects against social impacts before reaching decisions. Politicans with different constituencies will take different approaches to problems. Each politician has to show his constituents that he is "right" on issues which concern them. The great political issues of the day- energy, unemployment, environmental protection, economic lassitude, armamentation, welfare, education, health care- have to be dealt with gingerly because they are controversial- not due to diversity of value premises so much as to diversity of political interest groups who will threaten to throw the rascals out if they don't get their own way. Lobbying has become a science rather than an art, and the computers spew out the data on congressional representatives and legislators to enable the lobbyists to determine the best bets for the investment of their campaign contributions. Bureaucrats have long known that those who are successful are the ones

who have avoided getting caught with their signatures on the bottom line. Paper shuffling, procrastination and obfuscation are the stock strategies. Politicians have learned these lessons well. With more access to information than legislators have ever had, more assistants and more technological aids, it is taking longer to effect decisions than ever before. Modern legislative decisions are rarely, if ever, solutions. Political solutions basically cannot be found in a society in which citizens are seeking gratification rather than truth.

Fisher Ames is attributed as having described the difference between monarchy and democracy. Monarchy, he said is like a majestic ship. It sails gloriously over the waves but, finally, strikes a reef, sinks, and is gone forever. Democracy, on the other hand, is like a raft. It bobbles without glamour on the tops of waves. It sails on and on. It never sinks but, "Damn it, your feet are always in the water."

So it is with our political system. It doesn't always work to give satisfaction. It is neither efficient nor remarkably adaptive, but it not only persists, it tends, in the long run, to serve basic human needs. Somehow, the founders of this nation were able to take Montesquieu's theory of the three branches of government and weld it into a federal Constitution which, with all its short comings, has, particularly in times of crisis, served the public interest, tempered extremism, maintained the ideals of individual integrity, and been alert to the needs of protecting this union.

Like General Kututzov in Tolstay's War and Peace, one must accept time and patience as the champions for the preservation of our democratic heritage.

The most significant social revolution in our day failed to make headway on the political fronts where it could and should have been solved. Politically, the people of this nation tolerated discrimination and abuse of discretion of those in power against minorities, to the utter disgrace of our entire system. Shamefully late, the constitution was brought into play to begin the re-construction process. Although the process of rectification has been torturously slow there can be no doubt that great gains have been made. The balancing of power and authority among the branches of government has served not only to retain a certain orthodoxy of commitment to basic principles but also to define how those principles should and must be applied to contemporary issues and problems. As Ames said, our feet are in the water, but we do sail on and on!

The social fabric of the nation is understandably stronger even though in a state of confusion as a result of the change. It is not easy for this nation or any nation to be color blind, when race and color have been the trademarks of privilege and social prestige for so many generations. The evils of the colonial psychology toward native peoples persist, and the myths of racial differences are fostered by demagogues who prey upon the fears and fancies of ignorant people at all levels of the social spectrum.

A new egalitarianism has arisen and it has taken forms never dreamed of in any previous age. Remarkable to say, our political system became responsive to it after the courts and a few social institutions opened the gates and began to pave the way.

Perhaps, one could be crass and say that the political responsiveness was the result of discovery that here was a potential for a new block of votes. Perhaps, one could argue that there was a sudden recognition that the price for maintaining our social equillibrium was to remove the bars of discrimination. Perhaps, there was a realization that a coalition of disaffected minorities, if effected, could become a dominating political force, and co-optation by prevailing power incumbants was the better part of valor. Be it as it may, the result has been a gigantic leap forward in the recognition of the integrity of all individuals no matter of what race, religion, sex, or state of physical well-being. In some ways the political and executive arms of state exceeded the legal requirements since they decreed that the elimination of both de jure and de facto measures of discrimination was not enough. Affirmative steps need to be taken not only to end all forms of discriminatory practices but to make amends for deprivations experienced in the past.

Nevertheless, the new affirmative potential for unity has also been a cause for some further fragmentation. Privilege relinguishes its perquisites reluctantly. Those who feel born to

power resist the denigration of the realities of the competitive market place. So the male bastions of privileges of accessibility fight to maintain the "purity" of their clubs, the same as do the racial and religious sectors. The synthesis of new perspectives has given rise to new antitheses which slow progress and dissipate energies.

However, the course which the nation has taken is part, now, of a world thrust, and it will not be turned back. The organic filaments of society, as Carlyle described them, have created change, and for those who have been deprived, disaffected and the objects of discrimination, as John Hersey noted, change is in itself an illusion of freedom.

Our efforts have opened new realms of opportunity for many who, in previous times, have been denied such access, but this accomplishment has not been without its social costs. For one, a new lawlessness and derogation of the instruments of law seems to have permeated the land. There seems to be an alarming need for people whose privilege and status are threatened to revert to infantile needs for self-gratification. When it is not apparent or forthcoming, there is a reversion to the animal instincts to strike back, to lash out, to destroy and tear down. Groups with special aims see the use of force and the exercise of terror as legitimate means to achieve their ends. Some become so obsessed with their own self-righteousness that they proclaim that their right to advance their causes, even if deluded, justify whatever existential means

they would, on the fleeting moment, employ.

The flagrant violation of law by some religious groups and their tacit, it not overt, encouragement of violence has been one of the saddest chapters written in the current history. But it is also true that when educators had a chance to respond to the constitutional challenge to end racial privilege and discrimination, to heed the Supreme Court's charge to find solutions to the varied problems which would arise in the implementation of the Brown decision, many, instead, aided and abetted in the diversion of the public's funds to fight rear guard actions against the law. Parents and teachers have also fostered this lawlessness by their actions if not their words, and the law as a civilized means for achieving justice and encouraging compassion and the use of reason in the conduct of human affairs, as both the Hebrews and the Greeks viewed it, has been subverted.

The second fragmenting reality accompanying the new egality arises out of our failure to eliminate the vast and debilitating reach of poverty in human society. Poverty still strikes deepest among racial minorities. To reduce some of the ill effects, we have employed palliatives which may perpetuate rather than relieve the pathology. Since the abolition of the work relief programs following the achievement of full employment to provide for the necessities of war, we adopted the policy of maintaining a vast and not otherwise incapacitated segment of the population as the economic wards of the

state. The result has been the creation of an under class which has been given an entitlement to public support. Allied with the bureaucracy created to distribute largesse to them, they constitute a powerful political force with the single concern to perpetuate and extend the system. Whatever measure taken to date, we have failed to enlarge the working force substantially enough to relieve the burden. Concentrated into ghettos from which few escape, the extreme poor live amidst the most alienating conditions, and society provides them sufficient sustenance to survive and to provide a few of the pleasures of life, but no realistic hope for amelioration.

President Johnson linked the problems of alienation and poverty with the growing lawlessness, when he presented the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders to the nation in 1968. He stated:

> ...The only genuine, long range solution for what has happened lies in an attack -- mounted at every level-- upon the conditions that breed despair and violence. All of us know what those conditions are: ignorance, discrimination, slums, poverty, disease, not enough jobs. We should attack these conditions-- not because we are frightened by conflict, but because there is simply no other way to achieve a decent and orderly society in America...

It is difficult to determine what, if any, progress has been made in these fourteen years.

More than a half a century ago, the Spanish philosopher Jose Ortega Y Gassett warned of the consequences of a mass society in which little (if any) attempt was made to deal with some of the basic issues of its existence. We have such a society today. We have seen the officials of metropolitan centers become incapacitated to cope with

the security and safety of their citizens, incapable of dealing with the problems of the mass flow of people, ineffective in forcasting trends and providing for long range planning needs. Some years ago, my wife and I were taken to the airport in Rome by a most loquacious driver who, while passing some marvelous ancient ruins, exclaimed, "But, now Rome-she is now one big parking lot!" Difficult as transportation in the mass society may be, it does not constitute the chief dysfunctionality. Large centers also have become concentrations of poverty and of crime. Bureaucracies have emerged to respond to political needs, and they, too, have a tendency to become incapacitated by their own inner workings and to be the captives of the special interest groups they serve.

Large concentrations of population also provide opportunities which are not available in rural society. Large universities with sufficient accumulation of talent are made possible. Cultural opportunities are limited only by the capability to maintain them. Metropolitan areas are not only the centers of the arts, but they also foster the concentration of most of the intellectual and cultural resources of modern society.

But for all these opportunities, mass society also engenders a corruption of taste. Only a mass society could support our vast television networks which are programmed with a range from the worse to the best in aesthetics, with, unfortunately, the latter in very short supply. Only in a mass society could we afford to have access in our homes to the greatest artistic talents available in society,

but those talents are frequently subverted to a mass taste in the banal, the prurient, and the gross. Many years ago the Educational Policies Commission, in discussing the purposes of education in American democracy, defined three levels of illiteracy- those who could not read; those who could read but didn't; and those who could read, did read, but never read anything worth reading. Such is the state of aesthetics as well as reading.

The massiveness of society also necessitates, as Ortega warned, an almost pathological emphasis upon specialization. The tendency in modern life is for human beings to become cogs in gigantic enterprses, having little control over what they do, and deriving little satisfaction from what they accomplish. Off work, they can retreat to the sports arenas, the t.v. evening soap operas, or the discos and nightclubs to provide some excitement to otherwise uneventful lives.

In all types of endeavors, specialization incurs obligations which are almost impossible to meet. The professional person, try as she or he may, finds it impossible to keep pace with the research, the conceptual literature, and the new developments of the field. A doctor cannot afford to be caught without knowledge of the most recent treatments. The lawyer must know the impact upon clients of all recent court decisions. The educator must know how the Alpena School District responded to its most recent closure. Even the assembly line workers have a problem assessing to what degree their

skills and their jobs remain viable so that they can survive the thrust of robotics. Ortega forsaw that the time would come when we would all become "educated ignoramuses", overtrained to perform a specialized job, but unable to cope intelligently with anything but our own areas of specialization.

Nothing illustrates the dilemma better than the problem of communication in our society. As I write this I have in front of me a copy of this morning's newspaper. One story tells of the President's response to the Soviet superiority in nuclear arms, citing the recent information prepared by the Department of Defense. Hans Bethe, the developer of the H-bomb and a leading scientist of nuclear weaponry, states in an article on the editorial page that this point of view is nonsense and D.O.D. knows it--if anything the Russians dare not be seduced by their own propaganda. In fact, they have a problem of catching up with us. A third article quotes David Rose, a professor of nuclear engineering at MIT, that irrespective of who is ahead, there can be no such thing as limited nuclear war. Once the holocaust starts, the only life possible on earth is that which burrows into the ground, does not feed on vegetation, has fur and wears goggles. Since I desire to see humanity flourish and be preserved, I would like to have the capability to know whom to believe, whom I can trust, and on whose interpretation I dare to act.

As Harvey Cox wrote in The Secular City, in a mass society we deal with faceless people and know of them only by the services they provide. We are constantly placed at the mercy of people who have the specializations needed to perform. The airline pilot protects our

lives in the air. We may never see him, but our lives are in his hands. We are similarly mindlessly dependent upon the doctor, lawyer, engineer, teacher, pharmacist, plumber, congressman, bureacrat and politician. We place our trust for survival in them, although we read daily in the paper of those who misplaced their confidence.

In an age of specialization, society must protect itself by regulations which restrain the abuse of powers by those upon whom we depend. Even in a free society, there must be a constant concern for the protection of the rights and privileges of each individual at the same time that undisciplined individualism must be subordinated to the imperatives of the collective welfare. In dealing with issues of fundamental rights as guaranteed in the Constitution, the courts have developed the test of "the compelling state interest." Simply defined, this means that the state can restrict fundamental rights if there is a compelling reason related to the common welfare for the performance of essential public functions in doing so. It arises out of the off-quoted statement of Justice Holmes in enunciating his "clear and present danger" concept that no one has the right to shout "fire" in a crowded arena. The courts have been lauded and damned for their application of this principle, and yet without such a principle and its judicious application, it is clear that we would be at the mercy of those who have the power to control because of the special knowledge or skill they possess. A totally deregulated society would result in chaos.

For all of its problems, ours is still a society built upon consensus. Sometimes that consensus meanders

down tortuous paths and is distorted to serve the ends of special interest groups. How to find the truth! How to know what is right! How to establish a rational dialogue on basic issues and an understanding of the essential character of our problems and opportunities! How to create the working policies that provide relief, if not solutions! These are the imperatives facing contemporary society, in general, and education, in particular, today. This may seem to be idealistic, but it is, essentially, practical and pragmatic. Without finding some workable hypotheses upon which we can build a greater concern for establishing the common public interest and welfare, we have to be ready to face the consequences of neglect, disunity, and perpetual conflict.

In the face of this situation, our economy has presented a curious melange. The cost of maintaining our economically dispossessed wards of the state has been staggering. With economic distress in the general community, it has been further exacerbated. Amidst unprecedented opulence and a standard of living for the general population never before attained by even the wealthiest of all previous civilizations, we struggle with stagnation and the drainage of resources to the welfare of the very poor and the excess profits and tax loopholes of the very rich. As a consequence, along with heavy armament expenditures and the increased costs of technology, this nation, if not the entire world, is too impoverished to finance some of the basic functions essential for the continuation of its democratic forms of governance. Cutbacks are being made in essential human services. All but emergency maintenance of public facilities

is deferred. Highways are not properly repaired, and our pride in public sanitation and cleanliness has diminished. The educational system is particularly vulnerable. During the past decade the states' support of public education has not kept pace with the rate of inflationary increases, making it mandatory for schools to reduce services and for post-secondary schools to raise tuition, thus, in part, defeating the efforts of the poor and minorities to gain greater access to the knowledge and skills they need to utilize their potentialities. Because of the political stalemates created by special interest groups, little has been done nationwide to rectify obsolete school finance structures. In the industrial heartland of the richest and most powerful nation on earth, children have been locked out of schools because the citizens won't vote taxes, and the laws of the states generally preclude their assuming the burden. For years in the State of Michigan, some major school districts have had to pink slip the majority of their teachers in the spring because of the uncertainty of finances, in most instances reemploying most, if not all, of them before school opening in the fall. Is it any wonder that the majority of our most able college students shun preparing for highly uncertain careers in education?

At the same time that knowledge of teaching and learning is attaining new dimensions, schools are deprived of the resources with which to engineer new knowledge into viable methods, while the public clamors for the heads of school administrators blaming them for the rising dilemmas of public education. It is in this milieu that we are

assigned the task of preparing the educational leaders for tomorrow!

Preparing the Educational Leaders for the 80's

If ever there was a time for statesmanship in the governance of the affairs of humanity it is today. How often leaders must reflect on the words Carlyle put in the mouth of Danton as he awaited in prison for the guillotine: "O, it were better to be a poor fisherman than to meddle with governing of men!" Yet, for all its problems, that statesmanship is most needed in the stewardship of the educational institutions throughout the world and, certainly, in our own land.

Thirty years ago the professors of educational administration with the assistance of AASA and the Kellogg Foundation, created a revolution in the preparation of educational administrators. Some exciting and fundamental changes occurred particularly in three directions. First, educational administration as a function of community leadership became a central focus of most preparatory programs. The administrators we prepared became better equipped to understand and to work with all facets of community life and to establish an interaction of concern and involvement with critical elements of the community.

Second, significant strides were made to establish a knowledge base for the preparation and practice of educational administrators. We took from the best of organizational theory, behavioral

science research, management experience from other fields, and even in a few instances from the humanities. To a considerable degree we legislated out the rules of thumb, platitudes, and experiential anecdotes which dominated so much of the teaching of the past. On the basis of sound evidence and theory we tried to develop a rationale which could serve as a guide to administrative practice.

Third, we attempted to infuse the field with a spirit of inquiry. Because of our Kellogg funds, we could pay behavioral scientists to work with us and to establish an interest in our field. Several who became involved made substantial contributions to the research about educational administration to the benefit of their own disciplines as well as to the knowledge of the administrative processes and settings. Out of some of the basic findings of our efforts we became convinced that research modeled after the behavioral sciences provided the answer to the need for the improvement of practice. There was, to be sure, a serendipitous effect, but a serious set of unanticipated consequences ensued.

We established programs for the preparation of educational administrators which were built upon the finest academic models. We made our candidates sweat with statistics and research design courses until they could converse with the most academically dedicated students and professors in our midsts. We made them do research and write dissertations in the finest behavioral scientific modes. When they completed their training, the best decided to seek academic glory and reknown as sophisticated researchers and professors rather than

administrators. Roald Campbell warned this group that we were creating an almost unbreachable gulf between the researchers who dominated our professional training programs and the practitioners who had to manage educational institutions and, hopefully, provide leadership in maintaining and improving the educational programs in their charge. Campbell wrote that we needed translators to bridge over the barriers which our differentiated interests created, but too few of these translators emerged. The result has been that the gulf not only persists but is probably more unspannable than ever. Communication between levels has become more difficult rather than easier. The crisis of leadership in education and in higher education, we must honestly admit, is as deep as ever. Our field is bifurcated between those who are the seekers after knowledge and those who are the operatives in the field.

There are difficult problems in higher education with which we will have to deal. My purpose here is not to suggest the solutions needed to overcome them. Instead, I want to deal exclusively with the substance of our programs for the preparation of leaders who can help to develop the kinds and quality of educational programs needed by the people and their children in our contemporary communities. To accomplish this end I believe that we need to find a synthesis of six elements all of which are designed directly to affect practice in the field.

First, we need to develop the substance of our programs on

as sound a scientific basis as is humanly possible. I still believe we were correct, thirty years ago, when we elected to attempt to establish that sound knowledge base built upon the theory and research of relevant academic disciplines. Much was accomplished, but more needs to be done. But, more than anything else, our students who are preparing to be school administrators must be well grounded in that knowledge as users and implementors - as designers and engineers - rather than as researchers and theoreticians per se. I recently reviewed in detail all of the legal cases included in Volume I of West's new publication, The Education Law Reporter, and a large percentage of them resulted from administrators' failures to know the relevant law or to practice sound management based upon the knowledge readily available in the field. It is normal for the courts to pass upon complicated issues of law which arise from diverse, plausible interpretations of principles. It is a far different matter when the courts have to remind educators of the basic principles of sound administration and recite to them what are their professional responsibilities in matters of personnel, supervision, student conduct, and safety precautions. The administrators who didn't know, who caused hardships on employees and students, who cost their districts countless dollars and precious loss of time, were students at some time in our classes, and we certificated their right to practice-even though they obviously didn't know!

Second, this issue brings us to the recognition that they may have passed our courses and demonstrated knowledge of what was in the textbooks, but they didn't know how to apply it in practice, or how to control themselves so they could apply it. We need to place emphasis upon the applicative aspects of our scientific knowledge, research and theory. The people we certify to manage our schools must be knowledgable of how to apply, how to use, how to test new ideas and information in the furtherance of their leadership responsibilities.

Third, closely associated with the applicative aspects of preparation, there must be the clinical. There was a time when we

emphasized internships and field experiences. With our student body now predominantly part-time and attempting to maintain full-time employment besides attending college, with our teaching scheduled in late afternoon, evening, or weekends, and with students spending very little time on campus, even though the myth of residency prevails, there is little opportunity for a program of studies to include anything but the taking of courses. We learned some things in our prior experience which we do not now apply. We discovered that students benefitted by systemmatic observation and participation in several field settings rather than just one internship period. We learned that students needed "synthesizing" opportunities to draw together their experiences, to compare them with the knowledge base, to analyze the nature of the situation and develop the plans and strategies indicated by their knowledge and likely to be relevant to the situation.

A great need of the educational leader today is to be trained as a clinician. All professional fields have to face the fact that knowledge is not automatically transferred into guides for practice. Most people in human service professions need to learn how to develop skill in applying the correct knowledge to the right situations. As clinical practitioners of administration, they should be able to identify problems, diagnose dysfunctionalities, prescribe remedies, and evaluate for the achievement of desired outcomes. I very much doubt that they can learn such skills while sitting in the classroom and talking about problems. This, it seems to me, is the core of a preparatory program for leaders.

Fourth, an educational administrator ought to be a specialist in teaching and learning and be particularly capable of identifying those factors which foster effectiveness in teaching and learning. The truly capable administrators in our profession are women and men who know how to structure relationships in the schools and make decisions which aid the educational functions of the schools. There is a dangerous concern for management as a chief criterion of administrative effectiveness. Management is a tool, and we can have efficient managers at the expense of providing educational leadership in the executive direction of our schools. Children will be benefitted to the extent that schools are directed through the application of sound educational principles. This is not to say that we should not use sound principles of management and organization, too. The point is that there are no sound principles of management if there is no sound educational program.

Fifth, educational leaders should know the realities of the society in which they have to provide direction to the education of all ages. Irrespective of what our political, religious, or philosophical inclinations might be- and we will have as much diversity in our profession as exists in the world about us- there are some basic phenomena with which we have to deal and of which administrators need to have considerable knowledge and understanding. We live in an activist, pluralistic and culturally diffuse society. We live amidst world conditions which breed insecurity, anxiety, fear, and alienation. We live in a social milieu in which some children never learn to cope.

We live among diversities of religious beliefs and demands made upon children as well as adults. We live among conditions which breed aspirations for possessions and participation in activities but do not always provide the means to enable individuals to fulfill their aspirations. The educator who is to be more than a housekeeper of the school must know about these and all the other realities of our age: Where are we going? What's happening to children and adults in the communities in which they live? What are the portents for them for the future? These understandings may not be a part of the essential core of professional knowledge of other professions, but they clearly are of ours. As Willard Waller indicated in his classic study half-a-century ago, neither teachers nor children become unaffected by their lives in their communities when they enter the schoolhouse.

Last, we must make provision for the study of the ethical principles of administration and the values of the administrator. Counts found that administrators take on the values of the dominant members of their boards. Many developed reference group orientations in order to maintain their acceptability by power groups within their communities. It is alarming to see how administrators have helped to foster a cleavage in the schools between administration and teaching and how this cleavage has grown and become intensified over the years. As in all professions, there are some principles of the ethics of practice which are the canons of probity for the profession. Much of preparatory program revolves around the application of those

principles. That is basically not true in our profession. Some statements do exist but relatively little if any attention is paid to them. They are neither guides to practice in ethical conduct among practitioners nor critical elements of preparatory programs. Consequently, we have no consensus on the principles which should establish the criteria for evaluating professional behavior. Our research has eschewed studying the ethical issues related to the practice of administration.

In presenting a paper to a doctoral seminar in administration, Albury Castell, then Chair of the Philosophy Department of the University of Oregon once wrote, "....the unexamined administrator's life might not be worth living under!" How have we helped administrators examine the assumptions, beliefs, values, aspirations, and concerns which undergird their leadership roles? We are inclined to define leadership in psychological or sociological terms. The leadership we need for the 80's and the 90's and the new century, looming in the distance before us, should be analyzed in terms of its philosophical import and its ethical significance.

Leadership for whom and for what? This, as the bard would say, is the question! When I directed a study of the superintendency, we studied in depth two superintendents of major school systems and did not report on our findings because, at that time, they were peripheral to our major commitment. One superintendent was the amoral manager of a large organization. He was Macchiavellian in his approach to

the problems of the school system and the community it served. His perspective was to assess what was wanted by the power structure of the community and to see that they got it. If they wanted him to fight the teachers, he did so. If they wanted a return to the basics, he provided it. If they wanted him to fight desegregation efforts, he developed the strategies. Resources were committed to do the things he was bidden to do, and he did them well. Eventually the power structure changed, and it didn't want the leadership tainted with the stains of the ousted and discredited group.

The second superintendent was a thoughtful and dedicated man who was committed to the concept of a school system which prepared students to deal effectively with their problems of living in a pluralistic society. He was a well prepared and experienced educator. He was an advocate of the proper education of all the children in the district, and he endeavored to communicate with all of the groups and to build a set of commonly agreed upon principles for the education of all children, within the tolerance of the community and based upon sound educational principles. His was a dynamic school system where initiative and creativity were prized, basic issues were considered, and both teachers and citizens were involved. He, too, unfortunately for my parable, faced a set of circumstances where he had to resolve the dilemma of either prostituting his educational principles and the foundations of his professional career or moving out of the way. He chose not to fight and, as the other superintendent, moved on to another desirable position. However, he left a legacy in

the district and an ideal among his subordinates which have persisted.

In no instance will the leadership position be a bed of roses. Either way, with or without principle, the superintendency will be the pivot of diverse forces and the turmoils and anxieties of the community. Sometimes the protector of the status quo, the expert at maintenance and survival, will win, and the leader with dedication and courage to foster the highest of educational ideas will not.

The issue we ought to help our candidates resolve is which one better serves the needs of the learners and the best interests of society? The only sound measure of the effectiveness of our educational system is the quality of women and men we educate to deal with the problems of our milieu. The neglect of their education will set the stage for strong political forces to domineer and control. The educational leadership which truly gives direction to the proper education and development of our human potential will enhance the probability that this nation can again return to its fundamental values, commitments, and aspirations, and deal morally and democratically with the problems which beset it. The founders and conservators of this nation believed that its future depended upon a strong, relevant, and effective educational system. We have the obligation to prepare the future leadership within the meaning of that tradition.